

# **Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Concordia University**

## **Professional Services Division**

**April 17, 2000**

### **Overview of This Report**

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at Concordia University in Irvine. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

### **Accreditation Recommendations**

- (1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for Concordia University and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive system of selection, training, and evaluation of the field supervisors/cooperating teachers who supervise in all credential areas. The training should provide for effective role orientation and supervisory training so expectations are clearly understood, especially in relationship to CLAD competencies.
- That the institution provide evidence of a substantive process, including an action plan and timeline, to respond to all program standards which were less than fully met.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential  
Preliminary  
Professional
- Multiple Subject Credential  
CLAD Emphasis  
CLAD Emphasis Internship
- Single Subject Credential  
CLAD Emphasis

- 2) The team recommends that Concordia University provide evidence to Commission staff about the actions to respond to all of the technical stipulations noted above within one year of the date of this action.
- (3) Staff recommends that:
  - The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.
  - Concordia University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.
  - Concordia University be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2004-2005 academic year.

### **Background Information**

Concordia University Irvine, originally called Christ College Irvine established in 1976, is a four-year university, one of ten colleges and universities in the nationwide Concordia University System, operated by the Lutheran Church. The campus is located in Irvine, California, fifty miles south of Los Angeles in Orange County. The university system, along with two seminaries, over 70 high schools, 1600 elementary schools, is the second largest church related school system in the United States. From a single building and thirty-six students, Concordia University Irvine has grown to twenty buildings and an annual enrollment of approximately 1,300.

The university offers 17 majors in programs leading to a Bachelor of Arts degree through the School of Arts and Sciences, the School of Theology, and the School of Education. Concordia's School of Education offers a number of professional programs that may be partially or entirely completed as part of a student's undergraduate education. Credential programs are offered through the School of Education in Multiple Subjects, Multiple Subjects CLAD, Multiple Subjects Internship, Single Subject, Single Subject CLAD, and the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. In addition, programs in Early Childhood Education and Lutheran School Certification are offered.

The mission statement of Concordia University reflects the institution's combined emphasis in liberal arts and professional studies. The purpose of the School of Education is "to prepare early childhood, elementary, and secondary teachers and administrators for service in schools of all types, including Lutheran, private and public". The University and School of Education targets and goals, which follow the mission statement, focus on systematic inquiry, clear communication, health and well-being, Christian values, socio-cultural responsiveness, professional application, and aesthetic responsiveness.

Current enrollment in the credential programs includes 197 post-baccalaureate students and 61 undergraduate students including full time and part time. In 1998-99, the institution recommended the following numbers to the Commission on Teacher Credentialing for credentials: 58 in multiple subjects, 22 in single subject and one in administrative services.

There are thirteen full time faculty assigned to the School of Education, 9 with primary teaching and/or administrative responsibilities and 4 with responsibilities in other aspects of the university's administrative structure or student services area. Six faculty from the School of Arts and Sciences are utilized part-time by the credential programs. For the Spring 2000 semester, all courses in the Preliminary Teaching Credential programs and the Administrative Services Credential Program are being taught by full time education faculty members.

### **COA Accreditation Visit**

The accreditation team at Concordia University was composed of a seven member team, including the team leader, one higher education representative for Common Standards, a three member Basic Cluster, and a two person Services Cluster. The assigned staff consultant to Concordia University was appointed in July 1998. On September 3, 1998 staff conducted a previsit to Concordia University and over the course of the next year, phone conversations and several meetings were held with the Dean regarding the decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, and logistical and organizational arrangements. The COA team leader, Dr. Jeanie Milliken, was named in September 1999.

The staff consultant and team leader, Dr. Jeanie Milliken, reviewed the interview schedule two weeks prior to the visit and discussed arrangements for the visit to make final determinations on remaining logistical and organizational elements. The state accreditation team members were confirmed in early February 2000 and names were transmitted to Concordia University for review.

### **The Accreditation Visit**

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began Sunday, March 26<sup>th</sup> with an organizational meeting when team members reviewed interview schedules and documents and made preparations for their work. The institution provided a presentation and reception for the team on Sunday evening to orient them to the institution, its mission and goals.

On Monday and Tuesday, March 27-28, 2000, the team conducted interviews with all major stakeholder groups, reviewed documents in the exhibits room, and visited field sites used by the various credential programs. The team lunched together each day and met informally throughout the day. On Monday and Tuesday evening, the team met to discuss findings and observations. Following dinner Monday evening, the team held a group meeting to discuss the Common Standards and Program Standards and to discuss emerging themes and concerns. Throughout the visit, the team operated in a collaborative fashion, sharing information among clusters as appropriate. The Team Leader served as over-all coordinator for the team and checked with Clusters regularly to ensure that every standard for every credential program was being reviewed.

## **Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report**

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework* and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team arrived at a specific finding of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met," and the team wrote specific comments about each standard. The team discussed options to be used in deciding that a Standard could be "Met Minimally".

At the very end of the team report, clusters were offered the opportunity to make "Professional Comments" to the institution. These comments are not part of the formal recommendation of the team report and represent only the opinions of the team members. They are intended to be suggestions or items for institutional consideration.

## **Accreditation Decision Making Activity**

The task of developing one report for an institution is challenging after two days of conducting numerous interviews, reviewing documents, and visiting field sites. Each day at the university and each evening after dinner chart paper was used to record information related to each of the eight Common Standards, the Basic Cluster and Services Cluster. Tuesday evening comments were charted in the following categories:

Findings - A summary of all standards less than fully met including a rationale for each decision and data used to reach the decision. Cluster members were asked to review the decision guidelines in the Accreditation Handbook during the activity.

Strengths - Clusters may note area(s) of commendation specific to a program.

Concerns - Clusters may note area(s) of weakness specific to a program.

Professional Comments - Recommendations or observations for consideration that are not binding on the institution.

A time deadline was set to complete individual program charts and then all team members reviewed all other cluster charts in the room, adding comments as necessary or asking questions of cluster members who developed the chart. This activity generated numerous discussions on the contents of the charts, clarifying comments, checking across different program areas for consistency or repetition of information. A representative from each cluster reviewed their charts for the full group and answered questions about the specific program determinations. The Team Leader and staff consultant facilitated this discussion leading to consensus on the findings for each of the Common Standards and each credential program chart.

## **Accreditation Decision Process**

After the team thoroughly reviewed all the findings on the Common Standards and the various clusters, the accreditation team recommendation options outlined in the Accreditation Handbook were reviewed along with the operational implications of each. The discussion engaged the entire group as suggestions were made and clusters moved toward a unit accreditation decision. After considerable discussion, the team

decided on "Accreditation with Technical Stipulations." The information on the charts were then used to develop the narrative for the report. The decision was reviewed Wednesday morning after all team members had an opportunity to read the final report.

The staff consultants compiled all the various cluster reports into one document, and the team report was shared with the Dean of the College of Education Wednesday morning while copies were being made for the team and for individuals who would attend the presentation of the team report. The report was presented to the assembled faculty, staff, and administration at a 12:00 p.m. meeting by the Team Leader, Dr. Jeanie Milliken.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION - ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

**Institution:** CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

**Dates of Visit:** March 26-29, 2000

**Accreditation Team  
Recommendation:** ACCREDITATION WITH TECHNICAL STIPULATIONS

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution provide evidence of a comprehensive system of selection, training, and evaluation of the field supervisors/cooperating teachers who supervise in all credential areas. The training should provide for effective role orientation and supervisory training so expectations are clearly understood, especially in relationship to CLAD competencies.
- That the institution provide evidence of a substantive process, including an action plan and timeline, to respond to all program standards which were less than fully met.

**Rationale:**

The team recommendation for Accreditation with Technical Stipulations was the result of a review of the Institutional Self Study Report, a review of additional supporting documents available during the visit, interviews with administrators, faculty, students, local school personnel and other individuals professionally associated with the unit, along with additional information requested from administrators during the visit. The team felt that it obtained sufficient and consistent information that led to a high degree of confidence in making overall and programmatic judgements about the professional education unit's operation. The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the unit was based upon the following:

1. Common Standards - The Common Standards were first reviewed one-by-one and then voted upon by the entire team. Seven standards were judged to have been fully met. Standard 8, District Field Supervisors, was judged to have been met minimally with qualitative concerns. There is inconsistency in the orientation of master teachers and supervisors to their roles, resulting in variation in field placement expectations and experiences for candidates.
2. Program Standards - Findings about program standards were presented to the team by the Cluster Leaders, assisted by the Cluster members for additional clarification. Following their presentation, the team discussed each program area and determined that all program standards were met in all program areas, however, two were not fully met in each program. Each cluster then discussed in detail each program standard that was less than fully met.

The Basic Cluster found that all the standards for the Multiple Subject and Single Subject Credential Programs with CLAD emphasis, and Multiple Subject Internship were met except for Standards 4b and 6, which were judged to have been met minimally with qualitative concerns.

The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program found all the program standards were met, with the exception of Standards 1 and 12, both met minimally with qualitative concerns.

After the discussion about the standards, the team discussed and then voted on the accreditation recommendation.

3. Overall Recommendation - The decision to recommend Accreditation with Technical Stipulations was, in part, based on team consensus that all Common Standards were met with the exception of Standard 8. Although some program standards were judged to have been met minimally with qualitative concerns, there was consensus among the team members that the deficiencies are operational and administrative in nature. Furthermore, the team determined that the institution has programs of quality and effectiveness. Compensating strengths for the programs included consistent reports from employers that graduates were well prepared, competent, and effective. Therefore, the team reached the decision that the overall evidence clearly supported the above accreditation recommendation.

**Team Leader:** Jeanie Milliken  
Point Loma Nazarene University

**Common Standards:** Grace Grant  
Dominican College of San Rafael

**Basic Credential Cluster:**  
Don Grimes  
Grant Union High School District  
  
Michelle Britton Bass  
Antioch University  
  
Carmen Delgado Contreras  
San Mateo County Office of Education

**Services Cluster:**  
  
Ken Engstrom  
Fresno Pacific University  
  
Kathleen Henderson  
Sonoma Valley Unified School District

## DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog  
 Institutional Self Study  
 Course Syllabi  
 Student Teaching Handbooks  
 Follow-up Survey Results  
 Schedule of Classes  
 Faculty Vitae

Needs Analysis Results  
 Program Information Booklets  
 Candidate Files  
 Master Teacher Handbooks  
 Field Experience Notebooks  
 Advisement Documents

## INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Team Leader	Common Standards Cluster	Basic Credential Cluster	Services Cluster	<b>TOTAL</b>
Program Faculty	4	10	17	7	<b>38</b>
Institutional Administration	8	8	5	11	<b>32</b>
Candidates	10	2	115	11	<b>138</b>
Graduates	5	10	40	3	<b>58</b>
Employers of Graduates	2	3	15	2	<b>22</b>
Supervising Practitioners	4	1	26	2	<b>33</b>
Advisors	2	2	2	4	<b>10</b>
School Administrators	1	6	12	2	<b>21</b>
Credential Analyst		2	1	2	<b>5</b>
University Supervisors		1	18	12	<b>31</b>
Advisory Committee		17	17	17	<b>51</b>
Demonstrations of Technology				2	<b>2</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>					<b>441</b>

## Common Standards

### Standard 1 – Education Leadership

### Standard Met

Since the last accreditation visit, the School of Education at Concordia University has experienced considerable growth. The full-time faculty has expanded to nine from five members, the staff has expanded to eight from two, and the number of programs has increased to eight from two, of students has doubled. Accompanying this growth has been the establishment of more formalized processes and structures to admit, advise, and assess candidates while at the same time maintaining the close personal attention and high quality education that have historically characterized Concordia's educator credential programs. Because all Concordia Universities have an historical commitment to preparing well-qualified teachers, the mission of the School of Education is central to its on-going purpose. Further, almost all University administrators are former K-12 teachers and administrators.

Within this unit, the Dean is viewed as an advocate for the School and a leader in the public and Lutheran school community. The university-wide decision making process is well known and has served the School well during its period of expansion. The faculty is actively involved in on-going revision and rejuvenation, through task force work, regular meetings, and program teams. Decisions appropriate to the program level are made at the program level, in consultation with the Dean.

The School's mission is aligned with the University mission and is articulated into targets. The faculty has just completed the early stages of a new Five-Year Plan, which will include a more global perspective and expansion.

### Strengths

The faculty and administration of the School of Education are to be commended for the extent and nature of the changes that have taken place as the School's programs expanded and for the inclusive nature of the change process. The enthusiasm, high morale, and willingness of the faculty to move forward in expanding traditional offerings are clearly evident.

### Concerns

None noted.

### Standard 2 – Resources

### Standard Met

Interviews with the President, Provost, and four Vice Presidents as well as faculty demonstrate a high level of support of all programs within the School of Education. Each credential program is provided adequate resources to fund personnel to effectively conduct business. Support for new and/or expanded programs is awarded based upon demonstrated need, projections for revenue and expenses. Seminar classrooms, multimedia classrooms, and computer labs are available to both faculty and candidates. Collections of media and instructional materials are available for faculty

and candidates. The library provides sufficient print and on-line resources for support of initial and advanced programs of the Schools.

### **Strengths**

The University is to be commended for its investment in technology. It provides each full-time faculty member with a laptop computer to use in his or her classrooms and offices. Part-time faculty members are provided “loaner” laptops for temporary use. It has licensed CourseInfo, which allows faculty members to have a web site for each course. This year, in preparation for the new computer-based technology standard, faculty members have highlighted technology integration as the area for professional growth. Through the use of CUNET, the system-wide distance learning network, faculty members have the potential to design future course modules to be offered via multimedia.

Further, the University is to be commended for its excellent facilities.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

### **Standard 3 – Faculty**

### **Standard Met**

Full-time faculty in the School has degrees appropriate to their field of expertise and areas in which they teach. Qualified individuals are hired as part-time faculty members and are assigned to teach courses and supervise field experiences in each credential program. The University provides extensive process of supervising and mentoring new teachers, both full-time and part –time, and retain only those individuals who are consistently effective. The Dean observes the teaching of all faculty members at least once each year. Interviews with faculty, students, and district field supervisors indicated that faculty are knowledgeable about current research, policy and best practices.

### **Strengths**

Candidates report access to and support from faculty members and supervisors as invaluable to their success. Part-time faculty members appreciate the instructional mentoring provided by the Dean.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

### **Standard 4 – Evaluation**

### **Standard Met**

The team found that program evaluation exists using multiple measures, including course evaluations, surveys of alumni, employers, and students at the end of each program. District field supervisors and university supervisors are evaluated on an on-going basis. Graduates, district field supervisors, and employers who comprise the

Teacher Education Program Advisory Committee, the Administrative Program Advisory Committee, and the Intern Program Advisory Committee meet quarterly to provide suggestions on program issues and new program design. Task force groups of faculty members research issues of concern and recommend changes to their colleagues. The team found multiple examples of programmatic and personnel adjustments, which reflect the comments and concerns of constituents.

### **Strengths**

Candidates in particular feel that their voices are heard by faculty and program directors and responsive to their suggestions.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

## **Standard 5 – Admissions**

## **Standard Met**

Admission criteria and procedures for all programs are clearly described and available to potential candidates. Admissions procedures for programs are efficient and are available through a variety of sources. Students seeking entrance into credential programs can readily find information on the School's web site, in credential handbooks and recruiting materials, or from School of Education admissions staff members. All applicants are interviewed in groups by a team of faculty members.

### **Strengths**

The School's admissions staff members provide comprehensive and personalized admission information that is instrumental in recruiting students and in communicating to them the ethos of the programs.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

## **Standard 6 – Advice and Assistance**

## **Standard Met**

Overall, advisement in Concordia programs is extensive and effective. The School of Education staff members provide candidates with academic and program advising. Undergraduate students are assigned both a faculty advisor and a program advisor. Adequate information is available to students in orientation meetings, one-on-one program advising sessions, handbooks, mailed information, and group orientations. Credential candidates consistently report that program directors and staff members are available for advising and support both at the university and in the field.

Current and former students needing assistance report being well served. When problems arose in courses or in school placements, these were addressed quickly and effectively. Interviews with faculty members indicate a high degree of commitment to

the success of students enrolled in their programs and comments from students corroborate this.

In order to ensure that only qualified students are retained in Concordia programs, program directors continually monitor student progress. Regular checkpoints are provided in each program for evaluating student progress using a variety of means, including course grades, course portfolios, field experience logs, and culminating portfolio.

### **Strengths**

The School is to be commended for the multiple and caring ways it communicates with students. Candidates reported friendly, supportive contacts through the monthly newsletter, the individualized credential tracking, and phone call reminders from program staff. Faculty members are regularly available through email and phone contact if they have questions or concerns.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

## **Standard 7 – School Collaboration**

## **Standard Met**

The University participates with many school districts to place candidates for early field experiences, student teaching, and internships. These collaborations also include occasionally offering courses at school sites, co-taught by school district personnel and University faculty. These efforts strengthen the curriculum, provide real-life experiences in culturally diverse settings for credential candidates, and offer renewal and professional development opportunities for the staffs of partner schools.

Formal placement agreements exist between the School of Education and school districts. There are procedures for field experience placement, handbooks (for student teachers, interns, administrators, and master teachers; a separate handbook for supervisors is in process). Communication between the schools and the University is open and clear.

### **Strengths**

The School is to be commended for reaching out to districts to invite their partnership in establishing the internship program. Similarly, the School is to be commended for its participation in the Teaching Reaching Educational Partnership grant, recently submitted by a collaboration of seven universities and community colleges.

Master teachers appreciate the ways in which program directors take seriously their suggestions and make programmatic and personnel changes as needed.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

## **Standard 8 – District Field Supervisors**

## **Standard Met Minimally With Qualitative Concerns**

Interviews with students and employers revealed evidence that most field supervisors are carefully selected based upon their experience in the field as well as academic credentials. Field experience faculty are evaluated on an on-going basis and retained on the basis of quality performance.

Inconsistencies were found in the selection and training of field supervisors for the multiple subject and single subject credential programs. Some field supervisors were reported to not have the CLAD training in order to supervise a CLAD placement and CLAD authorization is not included among the criteria for Mentor Teachers for the intern program. While training in supervision has occurred this year, it has not been systematically offered to all field supervisors each term of student teaching.

### **Strengths**

The University has produced a comprehensive field experience handbook, that covers all the roles and responsibilities of student teachers, intern teachers, master teachers, and university supervisors.

District field supervisors are committed to the credential programs and to the University.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

# **Program Standards**

## **Multiple Subjects CLAD, including Internship and Single Subject CLAD**

### **Findings**

Based on interviews with candidates, graduates, master teachers, employers, supervisors, faculty, institutional administration, and a review of documents, the Basic Credential Cluster determined that all standards for the Multiple Subjects, Multiple Subjects with CLAD Emphasis, including Internship, Single Subject and Single Subject with CLAD Emphasis Programs, are met with the exception of Standard 4b and Standard 6 which are met minimally with qualitative concerns.

#### Program Standard 4b: Single Subject Reading, Writing, and Related Language Instruction in English

The team finds that Standard 4b is met minimally with qualitative concerns in single subject content areas. The teaching of comprehension, reading and decoding skills and diagnostic assessment strategies is not given the full attention necessary for mastery. This finding is based on reviews of course descriptions and syllabi compared with student and faculty comments.

#### Program Standard 6: Preparation for Student Teaching Responsibilities

After review of syllabi, samples of student unit plans, and interviews with master teachers, interns and graduates, the team found that Standard 6 was met minimally with qualitative concerns. Many interviewees indicated that the multiple subject program lacked sufficient preparation for teaching in the content area of math. Additional concerns were expressed about the teaching of science methodology.

### **Strengths**

There is no question that the Concordia University Teacher Education Program is highly regarded by employers, master teachers, and prospective students in the community.

The quality of the faculty, staff, and credential analyst was consistently noted by all constituencies.

The systematic development of lesson and unit planning throughout all phases of the program encourages candidates to develop a variety of skills including strategies for delivery of instruction, adaptations for diverse student populations, and models of instruction.

The team commends the faculty for the innovative modules in the single subject program as a means to provide access to expert teachers in the subject areas.

The faculty is to be commended on the extensive preparation of the teaching of reading in the multiple subject program. Students feel well prepared through the course on reading instruction. The team also noted the integration of reading and language arts

instruction throughout courses specifically in linguistics, field experience, curriculum and instruction, and student teaching.

Students consistently reported the ease with which they were initiated into the program, and that faculty and staff were accessible and supportive at all times. Individual attention is provided in all aspects of the program.

Faculty are responsive to making changes based on student input.

### **Concerns**

A perception exists on the part of some students that there is an overlap in materials covered in the course on linguistics and the CLAD course on language acquisition.

There exists a proliferation of paperwork in:

- Student teacher model sign-off forms which challenges the candidates' ability to meet student needs in their assigned classrooms.
- The production of excessively detailed unit plans in the single subject program.

## **Preliminary Administrative Services Credential**

### **Findings**

After the review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, mentors, advisory committee members and field supervisors, the team determined that most of the program standards are met for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. All standards in the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential are met with the exception of Standard 1 and Standard 12, which were minimally met with qualitative concerns.

#### Standard 1: Program Design, Rationale and Curriculum

The program does not provide sufficient specificity for administration and curriculum/instruction in the core courses.

#### Standard 12: Professional Perspectives

The program does not have enough specific assignments and activities directed to the administrative role.

### **Strengths**

It was found that each candidate is given personal and professional attention in the interviewing, course advisement, instruction and evaluation aspects of the program.

Students in field experience report that the University is dedicated to the full support of each of them.

Collaboration with districts is felt to be excellent as well.

Student success is in part reflective of the faculty roles as professional educators.

The innovative use of technology is found to be a result of recent funding and staffing efforts on the part of the University.

Advisory Committee Members, students and site administrators are universal in their praise of the innovative services and support of the program director.

### **Concerns**

None noted.

## Professional Comments

*(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)*

### Common Standards

- Because nearly ninety percent of multiple subject and single subject candidates complete a CLAD Emphasis teaching credential, faculty members need to continually expand their knowledge about and experiences with diverse learners. Commitment to the ethic of diversity can be built through alliances with other University units, with district and/or county practitioners, or community agencies.
- The School is encouraged to strengthen its efforts to recruit larger numbers of underrepresented groups into teaching. Explore linkages to undergraduate recruiting efforts, focused financial aid, targeted program offerings like intern and preintern programs, four-year liberal studies/teacher education programs, etc.
- The School might consider developing a well-articulated vision for graduates of its programs: characteristics which make a Concordia-prepared teacher or administrator uniquely qualified to teach in and manage public schools. We encourage the School to be explicit about the values, dispositions, and professional skills it expects in its graduates, rather than working with them more explicitly. In a faith-based university, expressing these values clearly makes them more accessible and inclusive for non-Lutheran students.

### Multiple Subjects, Multiple Subjects CLAD, including Internship and Single Subject, Single Subject CLAD

Current students suggested that they have an opportunity to observe the first day of school.

Facilitate peer support and communication between the teacher candidates during the student teaching phase of the program.

The institution should continually strengthen the connection between coursework and fieldwork.

It is recommended that candidates be knowledgeable of current local, California Department of Education, and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing policies.

The following issues should be considered:

Use of the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) as will be incorporated into new state program standards per Senate Bill 2042, which will also require induction for all future beginning teachers.

Investigate links to local Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Programs to ensure a seamless web of preservice preparation through induction.

Incorporate the new K-12 content standards to give candidates an understanding of the students and teachers accountability system in California.

More integration of CLAD is recommended in the student teaching observation report and student teaching evaluation forms since most candidates are CLAD.

For institution's information:

AB 1059 (Ducheny) requires the Commission by July 1, 2002 to ensure that all accredited teacher preparation programs satisfy standards for the preparation of teachers for all pupils, including English Language Learners (ELL).

Beginning July 1, 2003, the Commission may not issue a preliminary teaching credential to an applicant unless they have completed the new requirements for preparation to assist English Language Learners.

Beginning July 1, 2005, the Commission may not initially issue a professional clear teaching credential to an individual unless he/she has completed a beginning teacher induction program that satisfies the standards for beginning teacher induction assisting English Language Learners, or that has an authorization to provide services to ELL.

### **Professional Administrative Services Credential**

The team found the Professional Administrative Services program, although approved by the CTC in 1997, has not been initiated. It is suggested that a list of candidates, a schedule of classes and teaching assignments be made as early as possible. Prior to the beginning of the program, the Program Director and Advisory Committee should consider updates and revisions reflecting current trends and changes in the profession.